DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 221 CE 078 132

TITLE	Pennsylvania Action Research Network (PA-ARN) Staff Development through Five Regional Staff Development Centers. Final Report. July 1997-June 1998.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., McKeesport.
SPONS AGENCY	Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	39p.
CONTRACT	099-8011
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Action Research; Adult Basic Education; Adult Educators; Adult Literacy; *Educational Research; Independent Study; Information Dissemination; Information Networks; *Literacy Education; *Professional Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Statewide Planning; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Improvement; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Impact Studies; Pennsylvania; 353 Project

ABSTRACT

The Pennsylvania Action Research Network project was initiated in 1995-1996 to provide Pennsylvania literacy educators with the following: a better method for taking published research findings and testing and adapting them in their own classrooms; a way to study their own research ideas on a daily-action basis; and a systematic way to share and disseminate findings regarding best practices. The following were among the main outcomes of the 1997-1998 project year: the "Action Research Handbook and Planner" was revised; 4 mentors were trained to help 1997-1998 participants develop their own research projects; 20 participants received training; the proposal review process was refined to allow more expert input and improve quality control; and 19 research monographs were produced. In surveys of the project's present and past participants and their supervisors, all three groups gave high ratings to the training received by participants and the action research they conducted. (The report contains 53 references. Appendixes constituting approximately 40% of this document contain a list of 19 action research monographs published in 1997-1998 and the following 1996-1997 evaluations: external evaluation; field evaluation of 1997-1998 participants; impact evaluation of supervisors of participants in 1996-1997 projects; and impact evaluation of participants in 1996-1997 projects.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AE 3025-1252A
c.3

99-8011

ED 427 221

FINAL REPORT

**"Pennsylvania Action Research Network (PA-ARN)
Staff Development Through Five Regional Staff Development Centers"**

**Project Number 099-8011
July 1997—June 1998**

**Project Director: Dr. Gary W. Kuhne
Assistant Professor and Regional Director of Adult Education
The Pennsylvania State University**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G Keeran

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 078 132

TITLE PAGE

Title:	Pennsylvania Action Research Network (PA-ARN) Staff Development Through Five Regional Staff Development Centers
Project Director:	Dr. Gary W. Kuhne, Assistant Professor and Regional Director of Adult Education, The Pennsylvania State University
Fiscal Year:	1997-1998
Agency Address:	Pennsylvania Action Research Network Penn State-McKeesport, 307 Ostermayer Lab McKeesport, PA 15132-7698
Federal Funding Awarded:	$50,492
Project No:	099-8011

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education or the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and no official endorsement by these agencies should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE i

ABSTRACT PAGE iii

INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL REPORT 1

FINAL REPORT 3

- Statement of the Problem 3
- Goals and Objectives of the Project 3
- Procedures Employed 4
- Objectives Met 5
- Objectives Not Met 5
- Evaluation Instruments and Results 6
- Procedure for the Dissemination of Findings and Products 7
- Recommendations 7

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON ACTION RESEARCH 8

APPENDIX A: 1997-98 MONOGRAPH TITLES 12

APPENDIX B: EVALUATION STUDIES OF PAARN 14

- External Evaluation 14
- Field Evaluation of 1997-98 Participants 16
- Impact Evaluation of Supervisors of Participants in 1996-97 Projects 20
- Impact Evaluation of Participants in 1996-97 Projects 25

ABSTRACT PAGE **Project No.: 099-8011**

Grant Recipient: Pennsylvania Action Research Network: c/o Penn State-McKeesport 307 Ostermayer Lab, McKeesport, PA 15132-7698 Phone: 412-675-9473
Program Name: Pennsylvania Action Research Network (PA-ARN) Staff Development Through Five Regional Staff Development Centers
Grant Allocation: $50,492
Project Period: July 1997-June 1998
Project Director: Dr. Gary W. Kuhne, Assistant Professor and Regional Director of Adult Education, The Pennsylvania State University
Project Purpose: The project proposed to (a) train & mentor literacy/ABE/GED/ESL practitioners Pennsylvania in action research, (b) extend the development of the Action Research Network begun in 1995/96 across more of Pennsylvania, and (c) produce and disseminate practitioner-based knowledge for the advancement of the field.
Project Outcomes: The project produced the following outcomes: (a) a revision of the Action Research Handbook and Planner, (b) trained four mentors to assist the 1997-98 participants in developing their research projects, (c) trained 20 participants over the approximately eight-month research period, (d) refined the proposal review process to allow expert input to project proposal designs to improve quality control, (e) produced 19 research monographs, (f) continued building a data bank of activities, (g) continued an Issues Network System of research themes among past and present participants, (h) conducted an impact study on those who participated in 1996-97 as well as their '96-'97 supervisors, (i) conducted an annual meeting of participants and interested others at the 1998 PAACE conference, and (j) Conducted a participant follow-up evaluation among the 1997-1998 participants.
Impact: Impact evaluation was done with both participants from the 1996-97 project year, as well as supervisors of participants. Participant impact interviews were conducted with 18/27 of the 1996-97 action research participants between March-April, 1998 (one year after their involvement with the Network) with the following finding: (a) the majority (94%) of last year's participants as interviewed had improved their problem solving strategies, (b) the majority (94%) now deal with problems more systematically, (c) the majority (66.7%) had made lasting changes in their classrooms, and (d) the majority (66.7%) felt action research compared very favorably with traditional workshop/course training. Supervisor interviews were conducted with 11/17 of the supervisors of the participants' programs with the following finding: (a) supervisors rated action research highly; (b) wanted up to 100% of their staff trained in it, and (c) the majority (73%) could point to lasting changes to their institutions and/or programs as a result of action research. Summative evaluation was done with the current year's participants (1997-98) and found that participants were very satisfied with their involvement in 1997-98 projects and had made meaningful changes to their programs as a result of action research.
Products: PAARN produced 20 trained practitioners, 19 monographs of completed projects, an up-to-date and accessible data bank of all activities, a revised Handbook and Planner, an impact study on the '96 -'97 participants, and a follow-up evaluation of this year's participants.
Products Available From: Products are available from AdvancE or by contacting the Pennsylvania Action Research Network.
Project Continuation and/or Future Implications: The positive picture of project impacts suggests Action Research should continue as an important form of professional staff development within the state.
Conclusions/Recommendations: In coordination with the Department of Education, a more comprehensive plan for the dissemination of research findings must be developed. The Action Research Network also needs to begin to draw out patterns of findings and better disseminate these in ways the field can use. In addition, PDE should consider ways to use the Action Research Network to test new policy ideas or program thrusts. Finally, the emergent directions of practitioner interests and research could also be used to inform PDE policy.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL REPORT

Project Purposes: The purposes of this project could be described as a professional development "process" for improving practice at the individual and local level, and the development of a knowledge "product" for the improvement of literacy at the state (and national) level. Specifically, the two basic purposes of this project were:

(1) To continue to supplement the traditional professional staff development model being used in Pennsylvania by adding a practitioner-based model of action research and (with an added objective) to compare the lasting impact of action research with traditional workshops/courses in the literacy field.

(2) To add practice-based knowledge to the knowledge-base and literature as created by practitioners.

Project Time Frame and Activities Overview: Projects in 1995-96 and 1996-97 were carried out in the Northwest region, the Southwest region, the South Central region, and the Central Northwest region. The 1997-98 extension of this project sought to continue professional staff development efforts in the four regions already impacted, as well as respond to invitations and expressed interest in the Southeast. Two delivery models were used: (1) An "urban model" whereby practitioners met regularly--from weekly to bi-weekly--for several hours at an urban location for both the training and on-going meetings on projects, and (2) a "rural outreach model" where practitioners in widely dispersed geographical settings would meet only monthly for the training, usually for a full day. In addition to the meetings, participants had frequent contact by telephone/mail or e-mail with their group leader from the Action Research team.

Key Personnel: The Action Research team included:

Research Director:	Dr. Gary W. Kuhne, Penn State University
Field Director:	Drucie Wierauch, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Admin. Assistant:	Debbie Doyle
Team Leader for Pittsburgh and PDC Southwest:	Hedi Miller
Team Leader for Erie and PDC Northwest:	David Fetterman
Team Leaders for PDC Central/Northeast:	Kathy Kalinosky
	Linda Ritchie
Team Leader for PDC South Central:	Linda Ritchie
DataBase Manager:	Kathy Kalinosky
Issues Network Manager:	Drucie Weirauch
Monograph Coordinator and Assistant Editor:	Linda Ritchie

Audience: The specific audience for this project was literacy, ABE, GED, and ESL practitioners in Pennsylvania. Administrators, teachers, program planners, and counselors would find the report useful for ideas on various interventions that hold promise to solve practice-based problems. impact study was conducted on the participants and the supervisors of their programs of 1996-97. The results of the projects as published in the 1997-98 monographs (added to the 48 written over the past two years) will also be of interest to researchers. Permanent copies of monographs are

available at the AdvancE library in Harrisburg and also at the Western Pennsylvania Adult Literacy Resource Center in Harrisburg (addresses below), and on request from the Action Research Network:

Overview of Outcomes. Each action research project conformed to quality control standards set by the Handbook. In addition, participants' initial planning designs for projects were reviewed by a panel of three experts in order to give further input. Each of the 19 completed projects for 1997-98 has been made available in a monograph form for distribution through AdvancE and by the Action Research Network (see Appendix A for monographs titles). A data bank on all activities/participants begun in Years One and Two was continued in 1997-98. An Issues Network, begun in Years One and Two was continued in 1997-98, with all participants being given a directory of participants and a categorized list of all working on similar problems across the Action Research Network. An open mid-year meeting was hosted at the annual Pennsylvania Adult Education conference in Hershey, PA. An

Report Copies can be Attained from:

AdvancE West
WPALRC
5347 Wm. Flynn Hwy., Rt. 8
Gibsonia, PA 15044-9644

AdvancE, PDE Resource Center
Dept. Of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

Information on the Project Can be Attained from:

Dr. Gary Kuhne: ph. 412-675-9473
Debbie Doyle: ph. 724-727-2518

Mailing Address.

Pennsylvania Action Research Network
c/o Adult Education Graduate Program
Penn State University, McKeesport Campus
307 Ostermayer Lab
McKeesport, PA. 15132

Comment: Concerning the Nature of the Monographs

A "qualifier" has been inserted in the inside cover of each monograph which states that none of the individual reports assumes to hold wide generalizability; rather, each of these small-scale studies is strictly illustrative, informative and--hopefully --stimulative for other practitioners who might choose to replicate or adapt study to their setting. This qualifier has been added because those who are not knowledgeable of trying to be action research might assume that these are quantitative parametric experimental studies with wide generalizability. Quite the contrary. Action research adds pieces of a puzzle and any generalizability sought can be gained by seeking patterns of findings over time. Thus, the qualifier asks readers to look at other similar monographs as well as the literacy literature for patterns or; alternatively, to contact the Action Research Network team for assistance in this. It is hoped that, during 1998-99, such patterns will be determined and published

by the Action Research team with the help of the coordinating leadership a new dissemination committee under the auspices of the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

FINAL REPORT: PAARN 1997-98

Statement of the Problem

The Action Research initiative in Pennsylvania was rooted in a literature review demonstrating a growing awareness in K-12 (as well as in Adult Basic Education) that **"expert research" or "received research" is not the entire answer to everyday practitioner problems**. While the field of literacy does not lack "received research" (including 353 research), practitioners lack ways to systematically apply expert findings; to observe and validate the outcomes of their own work; and, too often, the confidence to share their knowledge widely (Lytle & Cochran-Smith,1990). As a result, the field does not develop or apply expert knowledge well, nor does it inform itself very well from its own practice.

Traditional school-oriented workshops and courses are perhaps the most extensively used form of professional development in both K-12 and adult basic education, but have **demonstrated important limitations** for the professional development of literacy practitioners, including:

(1) The geography for delivery of workshops is often problematic.

(2) The travel costs are usually a barrier for practitioners.

(3) The disincentive of knowing that very few practitioners will realize any career advancement/pay raise by virtue of traveling and attending "professional development".

(4) The constant problem of real content relevance in workshops and courses.

(5) The difficulty with on-going mentoring or follow-up of traditional school-oriented professional development workshop/course.

Awareness of the problems with traditional school-oriented professional development workshops and courses has lead many to suggest that the answer to improved professional practice lies in **self-directed learning by literacy practitioners**. Although self-directed learning activities can produce useful results for practitioners, there are a number of weaknesses at the every day operational level when relying too heavily upon such an answer. A better and more complete answer requires that practitioners be given:

(1) A better method for taking published research findings and testing, then adapting them, in their own classrooms.

(2) A way to systematically study their own research ideas on a daily-action basis.

(3) A systematic way to share and disseminate findings of best practices so improvements to teaching/administration/counseling do not need to be constantly "rediscovered" across the state and country.

Seeking to respond to the above listed problems and limitations of workshops and independent study, many adult literacy programs across California, New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia have begun using Action Research. The Pennsylvania Action Research

Network has completed three years of increasingly productive professional development assistance within the state. The long-term impact studies conducted in this project (see Appendix B) and the participant evaluation follow up study (see Appendix B) strongly suggest that action research is helping to address some of the endemic issues of traditional professional development and limitations of self-directed practitioner improvement.

Goals and Objectives of the Project

This proposal sought to add Pennsylvania's staff development efforts the dimension of "doing by learning," as action research's acknowledged founder Kurt Lewin described the working definition of action research. With the existence of 48 monographs and approximately 45 trained practitioners in the western and central parts of the state from project years 1995-97, this year's project sought to expand the network to include teachers, administrators, and researchers in the northeastern and southeastern parts of the state. It was hoped that practitioners could be linked throughout the state in order to provide a means to work together on common problems state-wide. The focus of all action research projects was on everyday program and classroom needs. A number of goals guided the actual implementation of this 353 project:

1. Serve New Areas: Engage approximately 35-50 practitioners state-wide in the four regions served in the past, i.e., the Southwest, the Northwest, the Central Northeast, and the South Central. The Southeast region will be invited join with the other four regions this year.

2. Employ A Consistent Training Model: Every participant is to be trained using the revised Handbook and Planner and, where possible, a mentor from the 1995-97 project years will be involved in the training and mentoring of new participants. The participants will receive frequent follow up calls from our team leaders. Learning from last year's experience, practitioners in wide rural areas will be served by action researcher team trainers/mentors with monthly day-long meetings. For urban areas, (e.g., in Pittsburgh) participants will begin with weekly meetings and move to meetings every second week. Rural practitioners, especially, will be encouraged to establish "buddies" within their groups.

3. Expand The Monograph Series: The edited monograph series of project outcomes begun in 1995-96 is hoped to be expanded by 25-30 new monographs. In addition, this year, a panel of 3 experts will be asked to review each initial planner from each practitioner in the early stages of projects. The panel will give individual feedback. The Project Director will coordinate the review and synthesize the feedback for each practitioner..

4. Newsletter and Database: A newsletter insert for practitioners was begun in 1995-96, entitled Action Update. It carried news about both the Action Research Network and PALPIN- - a Philadelphia-based project. Four issues were written and disseminated in 1995-96 and four are intended to be produced again this year. A data bank will be continued from previous years on all of the projects as a record of what has taken place and how. This data bank will contain names, addresses, phone numbers, questions posed, interventions used, results and was continued and improved this year.

5. Annual Meeting: The Action Research team will present a synopsis of the results from this year at the workshop entitled "Learning From Practice" at the 1998 annual PAACE Conference in Hershey PA.

Procedures Employed

This project was conducted from July 1, 1997 - June 30, 1998 in five different locations within the PDC regions mentioned above. Team leaders (Hedi Miller, Dave Fetterman, Linda Ritchie, and Kathy Kalinoski) conducted bi-weekly/monthly meetings. The team also made presentations on action research at the PAACE annual conference. Adult basic education, literacy, GED, ESL teachers, tutors, program administrators and counselors became involved from large urban, smaller urban and rural programs.

Every participant was trained using the revised Handbook and Planner and, where possible, a mentor from the 1995-97 project years was involved in the training and mentoring of new participants. The participants also received frequent follow up calls from our team leaders. Learning from last year's experience, practitioners in wide rural areas were served by action researcher team trainers/mentors with monthly day-long meetings. For urban areas, (e.g., in Pittsburgh) participants began with weekly meetings and moved to meetings every second week. Rural practitioners, especially, were encouraged to establish "buddies" within their groups.

An Issues Network was created so every participant this year (and last) received a phone list of categorized projects so every participant would know who was working on a problem similar to theirs or had worked on one last year. In addition, this year, a panel of 3 experts was asked to review each initial planner from each practitioner in the early stages of projects. The panel gave individual feedback. The Project Director was the coordinating point and he synthesized the feedback for each practitioner. It is evident that this external level of input has enhanced the monographs this over last year

Objectives Met And How

• Employ A Consistent Training:

The Pennsylvania Action Research Handbook & Project Planner, first written by A. Quigley in 1995-96, received minor revisions based on input from past years. This was used in all of the training sessions and was disseminated to the participants. The planner formed the basis for each project and only when this planner was acceptably complete and reviewed by the team leader and the expert panel was an individual's project begun. The Network team was oriented for this year at an initial fall meeting and, as described above, they met with interested practitioners in rural and urban settings as described. The evaluation of their training and the projects overall can be seen in the evaluations. Although not noted on the initial proposal, we also conducted an impact study on the 1996-97 participants and their supervisors (see Appendix B)..

• Expand The Monograph Series:

19 monographs were completed (Appendices A) and many participants said on their evaluations that they would continue with further cycles of the project and new projects using action research. A panel of 3 experts reviewed each initial planner from each practitioner in the early stages of projects. The panel gave individual feedback. The Project Director coordinated the review and synthesized the feedback for each practitioner. It was evident that this external level of input enhanced the monographs this over last year.

• **Annual Meeting**:

The Action Research team presented a synopsis of the results from this year at the workshop entitled "Learning From Practice" at the 1998 annual PAACE Conference in Hershey PA.

Objectives Not Met And Why

• **Newsletter and Database**:

The four newsletter inserts were not developed and disseminated this year due to decision by the Learning From Practice Steering Committee to centralize dissemination efforts. Unfortunately, no other dissemination plan emerged from the Learning From Practice Committee, with the result that little dissemination was done to inform practitioners of action research findings and/or opportunities. In previous years, some 14,200 copies were made available across the state. The data bank was continued from previous years on all of the projects and contained names, addresses, phone numbers, questions posed, interventions used, and results.

• **Serve New Areas**:

We were able to engage 20 practitioners in the four regions PAARN served in the past, i.e., the Southwest, the Northwest, the Central Northeast, and the South Central. The Southeast region was invited to join with the other four regions this year, but no participants were recruited from this area. It is hoped that the Southeast region will get involved in the 1998-99 project year. PAARN had hoped to recruit 35-50 participants in this year's projects. The team leaders held initial orientation meetings and had well over 35 at these but, ultimately, 26 were recruited and 24 went through the training. There are 19 complete monographs. The main reasons for involving fewer than hoped over the past year included:

1. PALPIN, a project with a similar set of process goals based out of Philadelphia inadvertently recruited from the same pool of practitioners. PALPIN held a winter institute in Philadelphia which recruited across the entire state and into the regions being served by PA-ARN, reducing the population base and amount of funding for practitioners at the local level.

2. The project began late in most regions due to the directive to coordinate recruitment through the Learning From Practice Steering Committee. Late recruitment reduces involvement since many have committed their scarce time to other projects by September.

3. The need for practitioners to be involved in Project Equal created yet another competition for already busy people.

Evaluation Instrument and Results

A comprehensive program evaluation was carried out over the project year utilizing four tools including (a) an impact evaluation with Participants from the previous year, (b) an impact evaluation with supervisors of participants from the previous year, (c) an evaluation of current participants, and (d) an external evaluation report from an expert in action research. The specific finding follow for each of these evaluation initiatives. The full results of each of these evaluation efforts is found in Appendix B.

• **Impact Evaluation With Past Participants**:

Impact evaluation was done with both participants from the 1996-97 project year. Participant impact interviews were conducted with 18/27 of the 1996-97 action research participants between March-April, 1998 (one year after their involvement with the Network) with the following finding:

1. The majority (94%) of last year's participants as interviewed had improved their problem solving strategies.

2. The majority (94%) now deal with problems more systematically.

3. The majority (66.7%) had made lasting changes in their classrooms.

4. The majority (66.7%) felt action research compared very favorably with traditional workshop/course training.

• **Impact Evaluation With Supervisors**:

Supervisor interviews were conducted with 11/17 of the supervisors of the 1996-97 participants' programs with the following finding:

1. Supervisors rated action research highly.

2. Supervisors wanted up to 100% of their staff trained in it.

3. The majority (73%) could point to lasting changes to their institutions and/or programs as a result of action research.

• **Evaluation Of Current Participants**:

Summative evaluation was done with the current year's participants (1997-98) with the following findings:

1. 90% were satisfied with the training they received.

2. 100% were satisfied with how the trainers conducted the meetings and the support they received from the leader.

3. 90% felt action research was a valuable way to resolve practice problems and add new knowledge to the field.

4. 90% felt the action research process was useful in dealing with problems.

5. 80% felt action research was helpful to their work.

• External Expert Evaluation:

An external evaluation was contracted with Dr. B. Allan Quigley from St. Francis Xavier University in Nova Scotia, Canada, a recognized international expert on Action Research and Literacy. The primary findings are as follows:

1. PA-ARN projects are becoming more substantive in the issues they address - probably because of the double-blind review process.

2. The outcomes are making a consistent impact on individual practice, on programs, and on agency effectiveness.

3. When compared with the alternatives for professional development and creation of shared knowledge, the PA-ARN project is much more successful than its alternatives, such as workshops.

4. Pennsylvania PA-ARN project is a model of successful operation and productivity. The system used in PA now being looked at for modified replication by practitioners and academics in British Columbia and Nova Scotia, Canada.

Procedure for the Dissemination of Findings and Products:

The products are available through AdvancE and the Network. In addition, the process and model are described more fully in a book from Jossey-Bass publisher: Creating Practical Knowledge: Posing Problems, Solving Problems, and Improving Daily Practice, edited by Dr. A. Quigley and Dr. G Kuhne with contributing chapters from various team members and a critique by Professor John Peters of the University of Tennessee. It is hoped that the new knowledge, the impact study, and the PA process will all be written about in adult education journals in the coming years.

Recommendations:

The fruitful outcomes from this year's project argue strongly for the continued use of action research as a professional development option within the state. The need for better forms of dissemination suggests that dissemination policy development become a priority in the upcoming year. Finally, the use of action research within the state has created a national (and international) interest in Pennsylvania's approach to staff development for adult basic and literacy practitioners, an interest that confirms the bureau's "cutting edge" position in the field. Building on this momentum by continued action research initiatives can only enhance the reputation of the adult education practice with Pennsylvania.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON AND RELEVANT TO ACTION RESEARCH

Apps, G. (1979). Lifelong learning: Problems in research. In J. Niemi (Ed.). Viewpoints on adult education research, pp. 1-14. Information Series no. 171. Columbus, The Ohio State University: ERIC Clearing on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.

Argyris, C. (1989). Reasoning, learning and action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, C. & Schon, D. (1974). Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boshier, R. (1994). Initiating research. In R. Garrison (Ed.), Research Perspectives in adult education, pp. 73-116. Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing Co.

Bryant, I., & Usher, R. (1986, June). Tension points in adult education research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Standing Committee of University Teaching and Research in the Education of Adults, University of Hull, Hull: England.

Catelli, L. (1995). Action research and collaborative inquiry in a school-university partnership. Action in Teacher Education, 16(4), 25-38.

Clift, R., Veal, ML., Johnson, M., & Holland, P. (1990). Restructuring teacher education thorough collaborative action research. Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (2), 52-62.

Cervero, R. (1991). Changing relationships between theory and practice. In J. Peters & P. Jarvis (Eds.). Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study, pp. 19-41. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cockley, S. (1993). The adult educator's guide to practitioner research. Dayton, VA: The Virginia Adult Educators Research Network.

Costanza, A. (1991). Participatory action research: A view from the ACTWU. In W. F. Whyte (Ed.), Participatory action research, pp. 70-76. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Deshler, D. (1991) - Social, professional and academic issues. In J. Peters & P. Jarvis (Eds.). Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study. pp. 384-420. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deshler, D. & Hagan, N. (1989). Adult education research. In S. Merriam & P. Cunningham (Eds.), Handbook of adult and continuing education, pp. 147-167. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fernandes, W. & Tandon, R. (1961). Participatory research and evaluation: Experiments in research as a process of liberation. New Delhi, India: Indian Social Institute.

Garrison, R. & Shale, D. (1994). Methodological issues: Philosophical differences and complementary methodologies. In R. Garrison (Ed.). Research perspectives in adult education. Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing Co.

Gaventa, J. & Horton, M. (1981). A citizens research project in Appalachia, USA. Convergence, 14, 30-42.

Guba, Y.. & Lincoln, Y. (1981). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hall, B. (1979). Participatory research: Breaking the academic monopoly. In J. Niemi (Ed.). Viewpoints on adult education research, pp. 43-70. Information Series no. 171. Columbus, The Ohio State University: ERIC Clearing on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.

Hall, H.; Gillette, A.; Tandon, R. (1982). Creating knowledge: A monopoly? Participatory research in development. Participatory Research Network Series no. 1. Toronto: International Council for Adult Education.

Horton, D. (1991). Social scientists in international agricultural research: Ensuring relevance and contributing to the knowledge base. Participatory action research, pp. 218~236. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Joyce, B. (1969). Alternative models of elementary education. Waltham, MA: Xerox College Publishing.

Joyce, B. (1972). The teacher innovator: A program for preparing teachers. In B. Joyce & M. Weil (Eds.), Perspectives for reform in teacher education (pp. 4. 22). Englewoods Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kember, D. & Gow, L. (1992). Action research as a form of staff development in higher education. Higher Education, 23, 297-310.

Kemmis, S. (1991). Improving education through action research. In 0. Zuber-Skerritt (Ed.), Action research for change and development. Brookfield, VT: Gower Publishing.

Kemmis, S. & MacTaggart, R. (Eds.) (1988). The action research planner, 3rd edition. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Kyle, D. & Hovda, R. (1987). Action research: Comments in current trends and future possibilities. Peabody Journal of Education, 64(3), 170-175.

Lowe, J. (1975). The education of adults: A world Perspective. (2nd ed.) Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Lytle, S & Cochran-Smith, M. (1990) Learning from teacher research: A working typology. Teachers College Record, 92, (1). pp. 83-103.

McDonald, B. (1994, winter). Director's column. The Community Exchange, 3(2), p. 2.

McTaggart, R. (1991). Principles for participatory action research. Adult Education quarterly, 3(41), 168-187.

Merriam, S. (1991). How research produces knowledge. In J. Peters & P. Jarvis (Eds.). Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study. pp. 42-65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S & Simpson, E. (1984) - A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults. Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing.

Nixon, J. (1987). The teacher as researcher: Contradictions and continuities. Peabody Journal of Education, 64(2), 20-32.

Okunrotifa, P. (1971). Curriculum improvement through action research. In Teacher Education in New Countries, 12 (2), 153 - 16.

Pace, L. & Argona, D. (1991). Participatory actin research: A view from Xerox. In W. F. Whyte (Ed.), Participatory action research, pp. 56-69. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pates, A. (1992). Collaborative research in ABE. Vision, 4(2), 1,3-4.

Peters, J. (1991). Advancing the study of adult education. In J. Peters & P. Jarvis (Eds.). Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study. pp. 384-420. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peters, M. & Robinson, V. (1984) - The origins and status of action research. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20(2), 113-124.

Quigley, A. (1995). Pennsylvania action research handbook and project planner. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Quigley, A., Dean, G. & Lawson, P. (1994). The protection of human subjects: Possibilities and problems in adult education research. In G. Dean and T. Ferro (Eds.). proceedings of the Pennsylvania adult and continuing education research conference, pp. 113-119. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Quigley, A. & Kuhne, G. (1997)(Eds.). Creating practical knowledge through action research: Posing problems, solving problems, and improving daily practice, New Directions in Adult and Continuing Education, no.73, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Shafer, C. (1995, December). Doing research with communities: Smart research that results in sustainable change. Innovations in Community and Rural Development. Ithaca: Cornell University, The Cornell PAR Network.

Staff. (1993). Exemplary Practice file: Adult literacy teacher, ABE, GED, & ESL, 2(4). New York Institute for Adult Development, New York.

Stenhouse, L. (1975). Introduction to curriculum research and development. London: Heinemann Education.

Taylor, E. (1993) Gatekeeping and the AEQ: An inside view. 34th Annual Adult Education Research Conference, pp.281-286. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.

Tom, A. & Sork, T. (1994). Issues in collaborative research. In R. Garrison (Ed.). I Researchers Directives in adult education. Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing Co.

Torbert, W. (1981). Why educational research has been so uneducational: The case for a new model of social science based on collaborative inquiry. In P. Reason and J. Rowan (Eds.), Human inquiry: A sourcebook of new paradigm research. New York: Wiley, 1981.

van Manen, M. (1990). Beyond assumptions: Shifting the limits Theory into practice, 29(3), 153-157

Watkins, K. & Brooks, A. (1994). The emerging power of action inquiry technologies. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education Series no. 63. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weisbord, H. (1987). Productive workplaces: Organizing and managing for dignity, meaning, and community. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Whitehead, J. (1989). How do we improve research-based professionalism in education? A question which includes action research, educational theory and the politics of educational knowledge. British Educational Journal, 15(1), pp. 3-17.

Whyte, W. (Ed.) (1991). Participatory action research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Wilson, A. (1992). Science and the professionalization of American adult education:, 1934-1989: A study of knowledge development in the adult education handbooks. A. Blunt (Ed.), Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Adult Education Research Conference pp. 260-266. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan.

APPENDIX A: 1997-98 MONOGRAPH TITLES

Marcia Anderson: "Changing Administrative Structure to Encourage More Decision-Making and Accountability of Existing Staff"

E. Bruce Cornes: "Newsletter in A Prison Setting"

Marlene Day: "Noticing Changes in Parenting"

Darbie J Evans: "Increasing GED Testing"

Brenda Garcia: "Increasing Student - Parent Interaction Time to Improve Student School Studies"

KayLynn Hamilton: "Integration of Technology into Literacy, ESL, and ABE Programs"

Jamie Jones: "Partnering Students to Improve Student Performance"

Fran Lemansky: "Part Time Staff Retention"

Gayle Y. Miles: "The Development of Goal Setting and Planning in GED and ABE Students"

Lynn W. Muchler-Stash: "Eliminating Finger Counting in Addition"

Marian O'Leary: "GED Testing"

Patricia Reynolds: "Learner Recruitment"

Sydney A Schwartz Hardiman: "Volunteer Recruitment"

Sue Snider: "Fine Tuning GPLC's Informational Orientation to Increase Retention"

Cynthia Spencer and Sara Plant: "Encouraging Students to Engage in a Self- Directed Job Search"

Amy Wilson: "Introducing Computer-Assisted Learning to Workforce Literacy Math Classes"

Libby Wilson: "Adult RIF Program"

Cathy W. Wright: "Increasing GED Student Motivation to Attend More Instructional Hours Through Demonstration of Correlation Between Instruction and Improved scores"

Richard G. Yates, Jr. "Using Flashcards and Audiotaped Words to Increase Literacy Students' Vocabulary - Cycle 2

APPENDIX B : 1996/97 EVALUATIONS

I. External Review of the 1998 Pennsylvania Action Research Network Project

NOTE: External Evaluation Was Conducted by B. Allan Quigley, Ed.D. - Returned June 5, 1998

By way of a summative evaluation of PA-ARN activities for 1997-98, I have carefully reviewed the follow-up impact studies of participants and their supervisors as conducted by the staff of PA-ARN for 1997-98. I have compared these two studies with the previous year's follow-up impact studies on participants and their supervisors. By way of formative evaluation, I was involved in the review of all of the participants' 1997-1998 projects prior to implementation, acting as one on a panel of outside reviewers in the "double-blind" process of pre-project input and approvals. Further, I was in touch with Dr. Gary Kuhne during the project and reviewed progress at length with Drucie Weirauch at the mid-point of the 1997-98 activities.

Overview of the PA-ARN Follow-Up Studies for 1997 & 1998

I note that both surveys for the two years were conducted on groups of action research participants and, separately, on their supervisors. All of the subjects involved in both years had been engaged with an action research (AR) project or supervision of an AR participant a full year earlier - they were all reflecting on activities which had taken place some 12 months earlier. This constitutes meaningful follow-up impact studies. The adult education literature on evaluation makes clear that "end-of program" evaluation--common in ABE/ESL/Literacy programs--Is considerably lower in validity than true follow-up evaluation such as this. Secondly, I note Debbie Doyle again conducted the investigation for this year. I know Debbie Doyle's work and have every confidence in it. I also know the quality of Dr. Kuhne's work, her supervisor in the project. It too is exemplary.

Examination of Results and Outcomes:

A. Review of Participant Follow-Up Impact Studies:

Reviewing and comparing the follow-up impact studies for the two years, it is noted that 2 more participants responded this year as compared to last, and 3 more supervisors were engaged this year in the follow-up as compared to last. This indicates increases in participation year-over-year. It is noted that, in the 1997 study, 94% said they had look at problems "in a more systematic way as a result of action research." By comparison, 94% said the same this year. Where as 50% said they assisted others in AR last year, 83% assisted others in action research as compared to 50% last. These outcomes remain impressive, indicating individual development as well as growth of AR within institutions.

Showing no significant increase, this year 44% said they saw change in their agencies' procedures as a result of AR, it was 44%-- the same percentage-- last year. This year, 55.6% said they had realized changes in their program as a result of action research, last year it was 62.5%. This year 66.7% made classroom changes, last year it was 75 %. These figures indicate stability as well as comparative effectiveness of the results of the AR process.

Looking at the comments on administrative processes, this year 25% said "deadlines" were a problem - none raised this point last year. This suggests a concern among participants, which is new. A quarter was having difficulty completing their project "on time." This can potentially compromise the quality of AR projects and the level of user satisfaction with PA-ARN.

The comments were positive on the AR "methods" as well as "outcomes"—both areas being highly ranked in the comments of the participants. In both studies, 1997 and 1998, participants noted how the AR process and outcomes have made a positive difference to their practice and both groups concluded their comments with praise for the AR process and PA-ARN. This year, one succinctly commented on the value of the action research project, "is actually using something that you are dealing with in your job. In workshops, 1/8 pertains to your job. AR is 100% all me; I'm the one formalizing and I have so much into it."

A. 1.: Conclusion Regarding Participants

Reviewing the data from participants both on a formative and summative basis, there should be no question that this year's project was a success. It has changed ways of seeing, ways of working, and ways of helping learners both at the classroom and agency levels. Compared with the options named by participants, AR continues to make a highly valuable contribution to practice in Pennsylvania.

B. Review of Supervisors' Follow-Up Impact Studies

Considerable progress is noted among supervisors over the two years. It is noted that 37.5% of the 1997 supervisors said they saw greater benefits derived by their employees from AR as compared with traditional workshops; whereas, in 1998, 54.5% said they saw more benefits from AR to their employees. In last year's study, only one of the supervisors thought AR met their "supervisor's expectations better than the other" whereas, in this year's a full 54.5% said yes to this question. In this year's, 89% said they saw attitude/behavior change in their AR employees, last year only 25% said they saw this in their employees. Change within institutions has grown as well - approx. 60% said they saw institutional change last year, 73% this year. And, well over last year, 64% of this year's group said there had been a course impact this year, last year only two out of 8 said they could see any change. On this last point, the supervisors were evidently more satisfied with the quality and extent of in-course improvement than their employees. Such comparative data in a follow-up study is useful in gaining a more balanced reading on articulated success.

B. 1 Conclusion Regarding Supervisors

The percentages given - from more supervisors interviewed, to consistently higher ratings from supervisors than last - collectively suggest that supervisors are increasing their acceptance and support for AR. The supervisors this year saw more extensive impact in more areas and had more complimentary comments than last. This could be as a result of the passage of time. Supervisors are typically not directly engaged with their employees in AR and it takes longer for them to see results. The results clearly speak to the growing confidence that the first line of supervisors in these institutions have in the AR process and PA-ARN.

Conclusion on the 1998 PA-ARN Program

This year's program results exceeded last year's in several respects - specially among supervisors. In my judgment, the PA-ARN projects are becoming more substantive in the issues they address - probably because of the double-blind review process. The outcomes are making a consistent impact on individual practice, on programs, and on agency effectiveness. When

compared with the alternatives for professional development and creation of shared knowledge, the PA-ARN project is much more successful than its alternatives, such as workshops.

I would add that I have been engaged in a comparative study of action research/participatory research networks in the U. S and Australia over the past year and can say with all assurance that the Pennsylvania PA-ARN project is a model of successful operation and productivity. The system used in PA now being looked at for modified replication by practitioners and academics in British Columbia and Nova Scotia, Canada.

Recommendations For Next Year

Concerning the reporting of results, I recommend the methodology used by the investigator be added - how much was questionnaires, telephone, or what combination of these was used? Secondly, on the operation of the project, the issue of deadline was raised by 25% of the participants. This should be reviewed by the PA-ARN staff. Perhaps the projects need to begin earlier, as several have said in the 1998 survey. Perhaps the timeline for conclusion of projects needs to be more flexible, or the PA-ARN staff need more support in the field, or the process of pre-approvals of projects/budgets needs to take place earlier. The point of starting projects sooner was raised in the 1997 study, but deadlines was not. This point should be looked at for change, if change is indeed possible

Since participants and supervisors alike have asked for this program to continue, since the indicators of success are positive and improving, and since this program stands as a model in North America, I would fully endorse participants' and supervisors' request to continue PA-ARN activities into the future

II. Field Evaluation Of 1997-98 Participants

(10 evaluation's received out of 20 participants = 50

A. ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROJECT:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
A.1 Notification about the Project.					
• *I had ample notification about the project before began:*			*2/10*	*4/10*	*5/10*
• *I had a good idea of what this was about when I responded:*			*2/10*	*4/10*	*4/10*

• *Comments?*

" I was a participant last year and am involved with the Professional Development Center".

" I had previously participated".

A.2 Training in Action Research:					
• *I was satisfied with the training on how to conduct action research:*				*4/10*	*6/10*
• *I was satisfied with how the trainer conducted the training session(s) for our group:*				*1/10*	*9/10*
• *The Handbook and Planner helped me:*				*4/10*	*6/10*

• *Comments?*

"The trainer was especially helpful"

"Hedi was extremely helpful and constructive with assistance and/or suggestions."

A.3 Support During the Project:

• *I was satisfied with the support from my project leader while I conducted my research project:*	*3/10*	*7/10*
• *I was satisfied with the collaboration I got from the other members of the group:*	*5/10*	*5/10*

• *Comments*

"Great group!"

"Research topics were so varied among the practitioners - hard to realize it was all research"

"Some issues more complex than others"

"Our project leader went out of her way to help"

"Dave Fetterman is a wonderful, sensitive, caring, kind, gentle , encouraging, etc."

"I was provided with a sample project and this helped me the most"

A.4 Administrative Suggestions for the Future?

"I feel it was handled very effectively."

"Pretty much keep it the way it is."

"Maybe just recruit earlier so we can have an earlier starting date."

B. ABOUT THE INDIVIDUAL ACTION RESEARCH PROJECTS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
B.1 Process Of Action Research Itself:					
• *Action research is a valuable way to resolve practice problems:*			*1/10*	*5/10*	*4/10*
• *Action research is a valuable way to add new knowledge to the field:*			*1/10*	*4/10*	*5/10*

• *Comments?*

"The process at times can be a little tedious."

"Research that is useful, applicable, and makes sense."

"I don t want to suggest that AR is an unworthy endeavor, but I fail to see much direct benefit. Perhaps I picked too broad a subject; I was unable to devote the time it needed. "

B.2 Outcomes Of Your Research Project:					
• *The process of dealing with a problem through action research was helpful in itself:*		*1/10*		*4/10*	*5/10*
• *The outcomes of my project were helpful to my work:*			*2/10*	*1/10*	*7/10*

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
• *Compared to most of the professional development workshops offered in my region, I believe this is the best way to invest my time:*		*1/10*	*3/10*	*3/10*	*3/10*
• *I will consider using the data I have collected in future grant writing:*	*2 = NA*	*1/10*	*3/10*	*1/10*	*3/10*

• <u>Comments</u>?

"Upcoming program changes are a positive result of something that wouldn't have happened without action research.

"I appreciate the thought process learned in action research, but question the "time" it takes to formally produce the finished product. The thought process is good to keep in mind when working in all aspects of adult education."

B.3 Significance of the Outcomes:

• *The results of my Study have resolved the problem I identified:*		*3/10*	*1/10*	*3/10*	*3/10*
• *I will/already have begun another cycle of investigation on this or another topic:*	*1/10*	*2/10*	*2/10*	*3/10*	*2/10*
• *I will/have begun another cycle of investigation on this or another topic and will pursue it without an honorarium if necessary:*		*1/10*	*3/10*	*4/10*	*2/10*
• *I will/already have shared the outcomes with my Co-workers in addition to the monograph:*			*1/10*	*3/10*	*6/10*
• *I will/I intend to present the outcomes of my project at a professional meeting in the future (e.g., PAACE, in-region meeting, etc.)*	*3/10*	*1/10*	*5/10*	*1/10*	

• <u>Comments</u>?

"My co-workers were impressed because they didn't expect the intervention to be effective".

C. EFFECTS OF THIS PROCESS ON YOUR OWN WORK:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
C.1 Perceiving Problems in Practice:					
• *I can now identify the types of problems I encounter on the job more clearly:*				*8/10*	*2/10*
• *I believe I can take better, more systematic steps to deal with problems I encounter on the job and will do so with action research:*			*1/10*	*7/10*	*2/10*

• <u>Comments</u>?

"It has enabled me to think more like a researcher on a very superficial level (not meant to sound negative)"

"It helps you to take notice"

C.2 Taking Steps to Effect Change:

• *I now have greater confidence that I can undertake effective steps to resolve problems I identify on the job using action research:*		*1/10*		*5/10*	*4/10*
• *I now have the confidence to help others take such steps:*		*1/10*	*1/10*	*6/10*	*2/10*

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
• *I will/am already working to bring about changes beyond my immediate work, in my program more generally, as a result of this project:*		*1/10*	*2/10*	*3/10*	*4/10*

• *Comments?*

"Program changes are under planning for the 98-99 school year".

"Action research is too time consuming to be used effectively in my work".

C.3 My Role With Other Practitioners:

• *I believe my role among the others with whom I work has changed as a result of this project:*	*1/10*	*2/10*		*4/10*	*3/10*

• *Comments?*

"As mentioned, my co-workers were critical of the intervention, but it was effective".

D. PERCEPTION OF SELF:

• *I believe my perception of myself as a practitioner has changed:*			*1/9*	*6/9*	*2/9*

• *Comments*

"I feel capable of doing another project."

"I now realize I have tools to make changes."

E. OVERALL

• *Looking back, some of the things I liked best were:*

"The sharing of experiences within the group helped the students understand themselves"

"The systematized approach of action research, the help of Dave Fetterman and Marcia Anderson and other colleagues, and the results of my particular project."

"The support from the group and facilitator involving clients in meaningful activities"

"Networking with other practitioners: the kindness and patience shown to me by my project leader, sharing ideas with other participants, sharing solutions with other participants"

"Exposure to working with other people in the field; seeing our diversity and different programs, the chance to experience what action research is..."

"Becoming more open-minded about research, learning something new, talking with other group members"

• *Looking back, some things I liked least were:*

"Compiling the data"

"Getting started was slow but once a clearer picture showed positive results it took off."

"The late start, getting projects returned (those read by the blind panel), in an untimely manner"

"The time involved, the frustration in compiling data (my background does not lend itself to statistics)"

F. SUGGESTIONS

• *If this project goes next year, my suggestions are:*

"Keep up the great work!"

"Keep it the same - The planning pages that were due mid-project were excellent for keeping direction."

"Start recruiting earlier so that the start date doesn't go past October 31st, then Completing the report for the blind panel to read won't be so rushed and will be returned in time for projects to get into full swing by the 1st of the year."

"Keep some incentive — the money is nice!

"I fail to see concrete relevance of these projects to our day to day operations. Where are these abstracts done in the past? How do we get a copy? Does anyone make a synopsis of results? What good is all this work and data if it remains on a shelf?

III. Impact Evaluation Of Supervisors Of Participants From 1996-97

NOTE:

• Interviews conducted between April 12 and April 17, 1998, one year after the completion of project activities.

• Survey conducted by Debbie Doyle, Project Assistant, under the direction of Gary Kuhne, Project Director.

• 11 responses/ 17 letter requests (64.7%); 1 non-responding supervisor is no longer with agency

A. DEMOGRAPHICS (Gender: Females -10 Males - 1)

1. **During 1995-1996, staff members participating in FFA-ARN:**
   11 supervised 18 participants

2. **How long have you been in this supervisory position?**
   Average: 8.6 years; Range: from 1 year to 24 years.

3. **How many teaching staff do you supervise?**
   - None
   - 4 paid, 45-50 tutors
   - 5 (3 supervisors)
   - 10
   - 15
   - 30 (2 supervisors)
   - Between 4~60 tutors
   - Many due to a lot of different programs

4. Do you have a written institutional policy on professional development?

6 (54.5%.) yes
5 (45.5%) no
11/11 responses

5. Have you participated in action research training yourself?

5 (45.5%) yes
6 (54.5%) no
11/11 responses

6. Have you conducted an action research project?

5 (45.5%) yes
6 (54.5%) no
11/11 responses

7. Do you attend traditional professional development workshops?

11 (100%) yes
Range: -20 Workshops/yr.; 45-140 hrs/yr.

B. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

8. Does your institution have specific written or verbal expectations of how staff should benefit from professional development? What are they looking for and how do they measure?

7 (64%) yes

"We instituted 4-5 things teachers would he proficient in; we use observation to see how training is incorporated and use a rating scale; assigning numerical number; we talk to the teachers."

"It is more verbal than written; we watch what's available from PDC to see if it pertains to our program and our students; we ask teachers how the workshops went."

"Instructors will be hired with the understanding that they will attend planning and training sessions; staff development is on-going"

"We require tutors have at least one in-service."

"The institution has an evaluation for teachers."

"It is based on my decisions specific to what supervisors need at any given time; we address weaknesses."

"We look at staff development activities and decide if this is a skill we need; the staff decides what they need, we only over-rule if we see no benefit."

4 (36%) no
11/11 responses

9. What are your expectations of how staff should benefit in professional development? How do you measure these and what are you looking for?

11/11 responses

"Staff should take advantage of every training opportunity when it relates to own job; you can't be overtrained."

"I should see changes in techniques or strategies, and changes in attitude for the opportunity to share, so they could mentor."

"Staff should indeed participate so that we will increase program performance and student learning. I can not actually measure student learning; it is hoped that eventually from investing dollars, staff development and performance will reflect in the programs."

"Staff chooses training useful to them if somehow it will benefit them; learning has to be applied."

"They can go to a workshop that is relevant to the program; I hope they will come back and implement; I don't really measure or scale, but find out through discussion with them."

"I want to see implementation; I do a lot of visiting to classes and talking about implementation to see effectiveness."

"If I could, I would like to attend at lease one or two in-services. It is hard to measure with an all volunteer staff of tutors."

"I should be able to see a change in practice; immediately implemented; and sharing with other teachers. At least once a week I am able to observe; I'm looking for instructional changes and teachers modifying curriculum."

"I bring PDC in every year for an in-service; we get information concerning activities available; I encourage PA-ARN and PALPIN. Most of the things are on a personal or individual nature, we have a small staff."

"It is based on my decisions specific to what supervisor need at any given time; we address weaknesses."

"Professional Development should impact practice; information, materials and skills should be passed on."

10. When you compare those who have attended traditional workshops to those who have taken action research training, can you see any difference between the benefits received?

6 (54.5%) yes

"Those in AR came away with a more questioning attitude, which is positive. AR people are more willing to examine their practice."

"People in AR are very enthusiastic."

"Those who have taken AR are much less hesitant to share information, comfortable making suggestions and able to receive Constructive criticism."

"They are able to work on a project, follow through and implement."

"The people in AR are better motivated."
"The difference is the benefits, from AR, It trends to have impact on the institution; with workshops, it is more concrete to the individual."

4 (36%) hard to say, can not compare
1 (9%) no
11/11 responses

11. Does one type of professional development meet your expectations better than others?

6 (54.5%) yes

"Both modules and AR are better than one stop workshops, Some modules are not as effective as they should be; AR is applied and I like it because there is a follow up; Workshops are not as effective as AR."

"AR is better for developing critical thinking skills and providing Structure for change; one shot is not enough reinforcement for change."

"When they make you more involved, or give you homework (assessment module)."

"Yes, I do not like commercial seminars; I do not always see a willingness to share what they've learned in workshops; PDC wants a greater expectation to share; AR participants were ahead of that expectation."

"We participated in a workshop training series which grew out of need we expressed to PDC; the identified needs were met through requests and followed up by PDC."

"Different expectation for different development; I am very happy; I did a staff survey and they gave positive feedback on AR and Learning from Practice - I found that things that extended over time are more useful - more than a one shot presentation"

5 (45.5%) no, need diversification
11/11 responses

C. ACTION RESEARCH

12. Of those who conducted an action research project, whom you personally know, can you think of any particular attitude change and/or behavior change which has since resulted from their participation?

9 (89%) yes

"More questioning and willing to discuss"

"Enlightenment and interest"

"More motivated to do research"

"More open to AR; see it as a more natural way to problem solve"

"They were able to have a vehicle to express themselves; they made changes and are stronger, more confident instructors; good for self-esteem; more people are listening to them"

"More aware of handicaps in her class."

"He tends to collect data and brings in charts when making decisions."

"Teachers modified what they do"

"More willing to provide input"

2 (22%) hard to answer
11/11 responses

13. Have any results of an action research project, made a difference to your institution or to any program at your institution?

8 (73%) yes
3 (27%) Do not know
11/11 responses

14. Has there been an impact on the courses in your institution from action research?

7 (64%) yes
4 (36%) no
11/11 responses

15. Is there any other lasting impact of Action Research that you can think of?

"The projects provide the initial incentive to push and then change occurs."

"Rich Is now looking at learners using limited words that mean something important; it is a big gain that he started sharing at workshops."

"No, but though I am saying no it is not a negative, I have no daily contact and observation; the scope of my program is a three county area; you need to ask person who participates if there is an impact to them."

"No, except for positive feelings for AR; even if you can not say "this changed this year"; everyone should go through this course, teachers don't know how to do this ; I would like to see them all have this course. It is a way of thinking through steps before making decisions."

"Perhaps we look at problems and problem solving differently. AR helps in Project EQUAL training"

"Enthusiasm; networking is extremely valuable, instructors don't feel isolated; plus they are getting paid to work with each other."

"AR is very much visible now with EQUAL collecting data for decision making."

"No"

"Starting to instill interest to participate in AR in other staff."

"AR brought a lot of staff closer together; they understand personal and professional goals better"

"The culture of the organization - looking at our jobs and improving what is needed; we tend to look at data and information more carefully before we make changes, and we follow the changes to see if they work."

11/11 responses

16. **Do you have any recommendations to the Action Research Network for the future?**

"We lost a bunch of people (who stated AR and then dropped out); they were interested initially, I want to know immediately when and why they leave so I can follow up."

"It is good that PA-ARN tightened up expectations; need to start earlier"

"Not really, it is one facet of staff development;"

"AR should not be another option, it should be integrated with improvement - used as a program improvement project; AR is so much easier as a support system - not a real burden."

"Don't stop - better not stop it, it seems to work."

"Get us started closer to beginning of fiscal year; a lot of amenities have been made to make it more convenient."

"Participants should present their projects to the staff before they get their stipend."

"The presentation of PA-ARN led me to believe it was more for teachers and not for administrators; that's why I decided to do PALPIN instead of AR this year."

"Start earlier"

"Not really, everything seems to go well, no grumbling."

"No"

11/11 responses

IV. Impact Evaluation Of Participants in 1996-97

NOTE:

- Interviews were conducted between March 12 and April 10, 1998, one year after the completion of project activities.
- 18 participants responded out of 27 requested (66.7%). 3 non-respondents (11%) are known to have left agencies.
- Survey was conducted by Debbie Doyle Project Assistant, under the direction of Gary Kuhne, Project Director.

A. DEMOGRAPHICS: Gender: Females - 14 (78%) Males - 4 (22%)

1. Years In literacy field - Teaching/Administration

6.9 years average, Range from 3 years to 16 years
8 (44%) in teaching
3 (16.6%) in administration
7 (39%) in both teaching and administration
18/18 responses

2. Qualifications (educational background)

6 (100%) Bachelors
6 (33%) completed Masters
1 (5.6%) M.Ed. Adult Ed
1 (5.6%) Doctorate

3. In 1996-1997, participants worked in the following variety of settings:

rural/urban	class sizes	sizes of agencies
6 (33%) urban	8 (44%) 15 or less	Range: 60-2400 students
12(67%) rural	3 (17%) greater then 15	
	10 (55.6%) one on one tutoring	
	5 (28%) sm group tutoring 3-5	

B. ABOUT TRADITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

4. Have you ever taken adult education professional development workshops?

100% yes
18/18 responses

number/year	required by supervisor or agency?
Range: 1-12/year	7 (39%) yes
27-50 hours/year	11(61%) no
(Conferences also included)	

5. Have you taken any courses (over a period of several days or weeks) relative to your profession?

12 (66.7%) yes 12 out of 12 answers in PA (100%) 1 also not in Pa
6 (33.3%) no
18/18 responses

6. Have you taken any other kind of adult education training, for example specific courses as adults as learners, and/or teaching and learning processes?

11 (61%) yes
7 (39%)no
18/18 responses

7. In general what was the best part of attending traditional professional development workshops?

9 (50%) Networking; meeting colleagues; exchanging ideas
4 (2 2%) Acquiring new knowledge
2 (11%) Relevant information
2 (11%) Comfortable learning this way

1 (5.6%) Time frame is convenient
1 (5.6%) Handouts
19/18 responses

8. What was the worst part of attending traditional development workshops?

7 (39%) Not applicable or specific to needs
3 (16.7%) Boring
2 (11%) Traveling to far
1 (5.6%) Topic was not what I expected
1 (5.6%) Not enough time to think and concentrate on one thing
1 (5.6%) Giving up other duties to attend these
1 (5.6%) Instructor could not train
1 (5.6%) Too long to sit through
1 (5.6%) No downside
18/18 responses

9. Were you able to use the material covered in workshops in your job? Examples?

18 (100%)yes

10. Can you remember teaching the content of a workshop to others afterwards?

12 (66.7%) yes
6(44%) no
18/18 responses

C. ACTION RESEARCH

11. Why did you try action research?

9 (50%) Supervisor suggested or encouraged
3 (16.7%) Sounded interesting
3 (16.7%) To explore issues or problems at work
3 (16.7%) To improve practice
3 (16.7%) New and innovated way of gathering information
2 (11%) $350
1 (5.6%) It was not like traditional research
24/18 responses

12. Why did you decide not to do an action research project with us this year?

7 (38.9%) Time
2 (11%) No longer with agency
1 (5.6%) Wanted to but kept missing deadlines
1 (5.6%) Could not think of anything to do
1 (5.6%) No support within agency
1 (5.6%) Became action research facilitator and had no time for project
13/13 responses

13. Why did you decide to do an action research project this year?

"My project from last year showed some results. Using flashcards 5 times a week did improve vocabulary a little; I thought it was something I could improve upon."

"Because I was pleased with results from last year and since then developed another plan, which I wanted to try it. I can be working with it all the time, and can change it and document it, and have the results and methods, then I can put it into practice."

"I thought I wanted to try another one; curious to check out if we had a problem; to try another assessment."

"I really enjoyed last year. It was good for moral. Good experience for everyone. You could document it"

"I had to drop out; but it kept me focused and worked nicely. I wanted telecourses for inmates, but ran out of time when it had to be done."

5/5 responses

14. What was the best part of conducting action research?

4 (22%) Seeing results
4 (22%) Networking
3 (16.7%) Trying an idea to see if it works
3 (16.7%) Creating usable information
2 (11%) The framework and having guidelines
2 (11%) Participating and doing it
1 (5.6%) Applies directly to what you need
1 (5.6%) Having data for accountability
1 (5.6%) It was not that much extra work
1 (5.6%) How far reaching it was
1 (5.6%) $350
1 (5.6%) Students liked being asked for opinions
24/18 responses

15. What was the worst part of conducting action research?

4 (22%) Getting to Meetings, travel, coordinating
4 (2.2%) Deadlines
2 (11%) Nothing negative
2 (11%) Documenting
1 (5.6%) Trying to minimize initial process
1 (5.6%.) Writing monograph
1 (5.6%) Rewrites of monograph
1 (5.6%) Follow-through
1 (5.6%) That it had to end
1 (5.6%) Funding not complete; could not use work time for AR
1 (5.6%) Lack of control over class attendance
19/18 responses

16. What was your project?

(See Titles In Appendix A)

17. What changes, If any, have you made in your classroom, because of your action research?

12 (66.7%) Made Changes:

"Changed some material; respond with positive thinking."

"More aware of importance of assessment."

"look at different ways of evaluating student progress in ESL."

"Able to provide more information to tutors and students and to gather more feedback."

"Continue using words important to the students lives for flashcards."

"More group work."

"Offer availability of extra help for workshops."

"Still using in-depth interviews with new students."

"I present in many different teaching styles."

"Try to build self esteem."

"Classes are less teacher centered and more student driven."

"Tried to work On a list of goals for students, but was not successful"

6 (33%) Made no changes
18/18 responses

18. Have there been any changes in your program, as a result of action research?

10 (55.6%) Yes

"More staff involvement in decision making."

"Continuing with GATB (General Aptitude Test Battery) Workshops."

"11-12 meet once a month for strategic planning meeting."

"Showed other teachers my project at staff meeting, and some indicated they would try."

"Use recruiting up front."

"Slowly we are getting more materials, we did not have enough."

"We make a point to call students once as month."

"Include writing home to kids in literature."

"Hospital made many changes, hospital wide impact on patient care."

"We are on the Internet; the students asked for it and the office now has it."

1 (5.6%) Do not know
7 (38.9%) No
18/18 responses

19. Have there been any changes in your agency's procedures, as a result of action research?

8 (44%) yes

"Testing using tape recorders are optional in post-testing."

"Changed impact survey."

"Continued with GATB (General Aptitude Test Battery) Workshops."

"We take more time to think, plan and evaluate, not just accepting things anymore."

"Started handbooks, guidelines in education and training of employees."

"We call once a month to students"

"Mainly what Marcia worked on (not specific)."

"Many changes (not specific)"

1 (5.6%) not sure
9 (50%) no
18/18 responses

20. Do you know of others who have used your research outcomes in their work?

2 (11%) yes
1 (5.6%) Interest shown but not sure if actually tried
15 (83%) no
18/18 responses

21. Have you trained others in action research?

2 (11%) yes
16 (88.9%) no
18/18 responses

22. Have you assisted others in action research through training and/or encouragement?

15 (83%) yes
3(16.7%) no
18/18 responses

23. Would you say you now have better problem solving strategies and look at problems in a more systematic way as a result of action research?

17 (94%) yes
1 (5.6%) can not say due to other training
18/18 responses

24. How would you compare the actual job relevance of the action research training with traditional training?

100% responded AR relevant.

"Very little traditional training has the research emphasis; traditional is more goal and task oriented."

"I liked AR better, I was in control; we got together periodically to keep on track."
"Some traditional training have been more beneficial; not as beneficial as some, and more beneficial than others."

"AR is extremely relevant; it is designed to be; you choose; if it wasn't relevant you wouldn't choose it."

"AR is much better, staff members need to be trained and need to know how to use the information gathered; much better than formal inservice."

"AR is more systematized on a program you can work on, developing change. In workshops you don't have enough time to incorporate, there is no follow up. AR is following up on what you are doing."

"AR is actually using something that you are dealing with in your job. In workshops, 1/8 pertains to your job. AR is 100% all me; I'm the one formalizing and I have so much into it."

"AR has more hands on experience, and opportunity to solve problem and see If strategy works. In workshops you may get ideas, but sometimes not opportunity to implement ideas."

"AR is definitely suitable to what your needs are instead of what others say you need. I wasn't being told my problem and how to fix it, it was my problem and was up to me."

"In AR, you have a different way of looking at things."

"AR is far more applicable, everything is applicable, you guide your own ship. It is nice, especially data collection."

"AR is superior, it is more hands on; it is relative to particular Situation than theoretical."

"You get more out of AR; you have to go back and do something, had to try to see if it worked, reflect and make changes. Some information in traditional training is gone by the way side."

"AR is something that will work in every program; it forces you to look at one thing at a time and see what works instead of trying many things at once."

"AR is more valuable; you are actually doing; right on the job experience."

"Can't compare, both are good."

"More formalized; there is an expectation that if you come on board you will have a professional outcome; it is a higher order by far."

"AR is very relevant, you make it personal dealing with specific problems."

25. Do you have any final thoughts comparing action research to traditional training?

5 (2.7.8%) No
4 (2.2%) Both are good
Other responses

"Funding should Continue for AR to try new ideas in action."

"AR is good, but with busy schedules, it is hard to get to meetings."

"AR is more in-depth in ways of improving practice and gearing to students needs. AR is a better chance of improving practice."

"AR is very active. It is my own little project and I have jurisdiction. In workshops, someone else is doing the work."

"If I had the choice I would choose AR, I enjoy that type of problem solving."

"AR should continue."

"AR is more hands on."

"AR is more interactive, where at workshops you are talked at. Linda was very good interacting with us; we shared ideas and I appreciated that about AR."

"Good to use together, because with different ways of delivering staff development you can see what kind of model best fits your issues."

"Overall AR was a positive experience, although it contains research, it is not anything like real research'. it is so much more applicable than other stuff."

"The future is a blend of both. I hope funding will continue for AR; people will benefit. It is so ideal. It gives a chance to touch base with academics and writing."

"Anytime you can integrate, it is superior."

21/18 responses

26. Do you have any suggestions for the Action Research Network?

5 (27.8%) no suggestions
4 (22%) expand time frame
2 (11%) expand role
1 (5.6%) Make getting a copy of monograph easier
1 (5.6%) Get word out to most directors of ABE to actively recruit
1 (5.6%) Change name, "research" scares people
1 (5.6%) more critical guidelines in accepting and reviewing projects.
1 (5.6%) permission to disseminate monographs
1 (5.6%) Communicate more
1 (5.6%) More criteria for the monograph structure
1 (5.6%) For people doing projects-keep it simple
19/18 responses

BEST COPY AVAILABLE